DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 246 431 CS 208 429

AUTHOR Smith, Michael V.
TITLE Changes in Daily Newspapers: Implications for Community Political Behavior.
PUB DATE Aug 84
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (67th, Gainesville, FL, August 5-8, 1984).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Audience Analysis; Community Attitudes; *Community Influence; Consumer Economics; Journalism; *Newspapers; *News Reporting; *Politics; Responses; *Social Change
IDENTIFIERS *Media Role

ABSTRACT

A decline in the daily reading of newspapers has been observed in the United States since World War II. In the decade from the late 1960s to the late 1970s, most daily newspapers employed market research to document and diagnose trends in readership, to estimate their present and future audiences' composition, and to assess the audiences' preferences in personal lifestyles in general and newspaper content in particular. These studies have made an important contribution to general pressures to align newspaper coverage and contents according to readers' preferences (and lifestyles) as well as to journalistic traditions. The impact of these pressures has been so great that by the end of the 1970s, newspapers could no longer get by with just printing news, they had to provide information for coping, helping the "new value consumer" seek self-fulfillment. The community orientation of the daily newspaper is no longer sufficient to provide the necessary economic support; though the relations of newspaper and community are interdependent, the social and political functions of the newspaper are also interdependent with its economic function. Newspapers are faced with the fundamental economic challenge of providing customer satisfaction while operating at a profit. (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED246431

Changes in Daily Newspapers: Implications for Community Political Behavior

Michael V. Smith

Department of Communication
2046 Frieze Building
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Michael V. Smith
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Please address correspondence to:
1514 Montclair Place
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Presented to the 1984 convention of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Qualitative Studies Division, Gainesville, Florida.

CS 208 429

Foreword:
Changes in Daily Newspapers

A decline in the daily reading of newspapers has been observed since World War II, and continues today.[1] In the decade of the late 1960s to the late 1970s, most daily newspapers employed market research (typically based on surveys) to document and diagnose trends in readership, to estimate their present and future audiences' composition, and to assess the audiences' preferences in personal lifestyles in general and newspaper content in particular. These studies contributed importantly to a general pressure[2] to align newspaper coverage and contents according to readers' preferences (and lifestyles) as well as to journalistic traditions. The impact of these pressures was so great that by the end of the 1970s, an industry survey found that ". . . American newspapers (were) experiencing a period of unprecedented, sweeping change" which has affected the very "character of the daily newspaper."[3]

Notes

1 Preliminary report, 1982 General Social Survey, National Opinion Research Center.

2 Factors contributing to this pressure include increasing corporate chain ownership of newspapers; rapidly escalating costs of newsprint, labor and automation, production facilities and distribution; competition from other forms of media for national advertising; and advertisers' demands for greater efficiency of coverage as advertising rates increasingly subsidized newsstand prices.

3 Newspaper Advertising Bureau, Inc., research report, "1979 Inventory of Editorial Content, Summary Tables and Findings (Weekday Editions)," pages 2 and 11.

Changing Daily Newspapers: Implications for Community Political Behavior

I.

The Assumed Role of Newspapers

There is a romance about the daily newspaper. The lure that drew Superman to the Daily Planet -- to be at the place where a community's pulse is taken and threats to its health exposed -- still draws idealistic and service-dedicated men and women to daily papers (Johnstone, Slawski and Bowman, 1976). The guys in the press room of The Front Page (Hecht and MacArthur, 1928), Clark Kent's byline competitions with Lois Lane (which he always lost), Humphrey Bogart's crusading and incorruptible editor, Lou Grant's struggles to keep his reporters uninvolved and objective . . . . All these portrayals, and dozens more, in fiction, theater, movies, radio, television, magazines, even comic books, over the last five decades have been remarkably consistent in the images they've transmitted of the roles played by journalists and their newspapers in the daily lives

of their communities; portrayals emphasizing (not always sympathetically) that dailies keep a constant light on all that's done in the people's name, that they expose hidden conflicts and schemes that threaten public well-being or democratic principles in some way, and then tell all about it. Whatever the story, the message is clear: Without the newspaper and its reporters, the people wouldn't know; and if they don't know they'll lose, little by little, control of their community. Publishers and journalists rarely object to these portrayals although they invariably are askew -- news stories are always urgent (which most news is not), protagonists single-handedly dig out truths and expose wrongs (which journalists do collectively, less quickly and more ambiguously) -- because they legitimate and foster public acceptance of their claim that the relations of newspaper and community are intimate, interdependent and important to the entire society.

Some version of this widely-shared perception has held for most of this century. Sixty years ago, Lippmann (1922) observed that "We expect the newspaper to serve us with truth however unprofitable the truth may be" (page 321) and we assume ". . . that the press should do spontaneously for us what primitive democracy imagined each of us could do spontaneously for himself, that every day

and twice a day it will present us with a true picture of all the outer world in which we are interested (page 320)." During the middle 50 years of the 20th century, the mass media played such a central and determining role in societal change and politics, that Janowitz (1978, pages 354-5) finds theorists had transformed what Lippmann considered citizens' expectations and assumptions into ". . . requirements laid down for the mass media by democratic political theory":

> "Political theorists and sociologists have elaborated these requirements in different language, but there is considerable agreement about the essentials. The mass media must (a) contribute to a high level of participation by all ordered segments of society; (b) stimulate effective political deliberation on the issues and candidates and contribute a meaningful basis on which citizens make their voting decisions; and (c) operate to preclude either side from monopolizing or even exercising pervasive influence by means of them. The mass media must also contribute to a sense of political self-confidence and enlightened self-interest on the part of each citizen. To the extent that these criteria are not met, the election process is not one of consent but degenerates into an exercise in mass pressure."

Although Janowitz makes an important contribution by making the typically unstated assumptions of political

scientists and sociologists explicit and interpreting them as required conditions for American democracy, he does not differentiate forms of mass media in terms of their roles and responsibilities in fulfilling their collective requirements. While the "press" is no longer the dominant media force it was when its social and political roles were analyzed by Lippmann, it is the only one of the media which explicitly claims, often in language similar to Janowitz', that fulfillment of such requirements is its singular responsibility and principal function. The first article (entitled "Responsibility") of the American Society of Newspaper Editors' "Declaration of Principles" captures this self-perception succinctly (Rivers, Schramm and Christians, 1980; Appendix A):

> "The primary purpose of gathering and distributing news and opinion is to serve the general welfare by informing the people and enabling them to make judgments on the issues of the time. . . . .
>
> "The American press was made free not just to inform or just to serve as a forum for debate but also to bring an independent scrutiny to bear on the forces of power in the society, including the conduct of official power at all levels of government."

Unstated in the editors' principles -- probably because it is a universally assumed condition among them -- is that the environment in which the newspaper serves its

"primary purpose" and brings its "independent scrutiny to bear on the forces of power" is the community in which it is based. It is the residents of the community that a newspaper presumes it represents when it declares and pursues its "primary purpose" and in its relative success in fulfilling its purpose the newspaper contributes to meeting the "requirements" theorists posit for the maintenance of pluralist democracy.

II.

The Interdependency of Newspaper and Community

The importance that theory assigns to their aggregate social role perhaps obscures the fact that newspapers serve the role singly and in the context of localities. This is a peculiarity of development, one not duplicated elsewhere in the world, and it has indelibly shaped the perspectives, practices and principles of American journalism (Bagdikian, 1971; Emery and Emery, 1978; Hohenberg, 1973, and many others). One consequence of this is that journalists have operationally defined "community" in terms of political-unit boundaries, much as political scientists do. While political-unit boundaries do not define communities of interest to social theorists, or communication scholars, or even the people within them, traditionally they have for journalists (and political scientists) be-

cause they define units with distributive authority, with powers to resolve conflicts and to allocate resources, and they are accountable to residents, whose political participation provides the ultimate authority in the community. A focus on the community as political unit is appropriate for the journalist and functional for the political scientist because it facilitates study of the American system's reliance on local governments for administration and delivery of essential services and because the extent of local participation determines the well-being of the political system itself (Verba and Nie, 1972). To give scale to the importance of local participation, consider that citizens' actions govern 18,000 American municipalities and 17,000 townships and, within them, directly elect some 500,000 local government units. A fifth of these half-million units are school authorities, and 70,000 of them have power to tax constituents. The election of representatives to increasingly larger bodies -- county boards, state legislatures, the Congress, is also rooted in the locality.

Generalizations about the interdependencies of the political process and the media do not emphasize the local character of participation and of politics. Concentration on Presidential elections and the extraordinary coordination of political actors and institutions they require has

characterized the efforts of political scientists and political journalists since the 1960s. The reasons are apparent -- there have been changes in voters' attitudes and coalitions, and they have altered the selection process -- and the national survey has become an increasingly useful and popular method for gathering data. A consequence is to neglect consideration of the local character of participation. It's illustrative to note that one of the most important studies of Presidential voting behavior (Nie, Verba and Petrocik, 1976) in the current era makes virtually no mention of local factors in voting behavior even though two of its authors' previous and highly regarded study of political participation (Verba and Nie, 1972) emphasizes community effects on levels of participation.

Accordingly, important generalizations about the interdependency of media and the political process typically look beyond the community and its residents and media to analysis of the decision-making of types of voters in recent national elections. Interestingly, some of the hypotheses guiding national studies have been drawn from "classic" pluralist literature based on studies of community political behavior (among them, Dahl, 1961; Polsby, 1963, 1980; Gamson, 1968). If the original emphases on communities is kept in mind when considering the implications of these generalizations, the roles of newspapers and other local media can be seen to be influential and important.

For example, though often quoted, it's not usually noted that Dahl was speaking of New Haven when he observed that, "Since few citizens ever have much immediate experience in politics, most of what they perceive about politics is filtered through the mass media. Those who want to influence the electorate must do so through the mass media." (Dahl, 1961, page 256.)

Again, by keeping in mind that the main arena is local, the influential thinking of Schattschneider becomes as pertinent to understanding the function of local media as it has been to the growth of democratic theory. He warned that the future of American society depends on extending "the scope of social and political organization" which can only be achieved by the "socialization of conflict"; that is, by forcing conflicts among segments of society into the open "to involve the wider public." (Schattschneider, 1960; pages 113, 39, 105-6.) Similarly, Gamson observed that before the resource-poor discontents of society can promote their views they must gain resources which requires finding "ways of bringing allies to their cause." (Gamson, 1968, page 140.) Lipsky, cited by Gamson, theorized that local newspapers are a principal mechanism for achieving such support for the resource-poor seeking to widen their constituency (Lipsky, 1968). In an important case study, Goldenberg (1975) demonstrated these

concepts operating in one community, Boston, where groups successfully gained and then used a newspaper's attention (as specified by Lipsky) to obtain their goals, eventually forcing the wider public involvement Schattschneider describes as essential to the well-being and survival of a pluralist system. Goldenberg's study also can be seen as the demonstration of a form of media in a community fulfilling its requirements, to paraphrase Janowitz, to be conscious of conflicts in its community, to be accessible by parties to the conflicts, and to have access to publics outside the conflicts.

It also should be noted, however, that Goldenberg observed that other forms of media and other newspapers in Boston did not respond to the groups as did the newspaper she studied, and did not consider coverage of them to be the obligation that her subject considered it to be. This suggests that the oft-cited interdependency of newspaper and community is contingent and conditional. Thus it would seem that the newspaper must have a developed and stable definition of community, a formal recognition of its role and obligations, and an organization of editorial operations to fulfill its role and obligations. If Boston had not been one of those unusual communities with competing newspapers, the likelihood of the occurrence of the process observed by Goldenberg would have been greatly reduced.

The independence of a newspaper in determining what constitutes its obligations to the community is not often considered in communication research, and even less frequently by students of community political behavior. Neither are the relations between a community's size, its social pluralism and the aggressiveness of its newspaper (or other media) in public affairs, although all of these relations have been determined in a number of communication studies (notable among them, Tichenor, Donohue and Olien, 1980; Clarke and Evans, forthcoming). Considering their general agreement on the theoretical relations of media performance, political climates and electoral outcomes, political scientists may have unwittingly sacrificed explanatory power by not considering differences among and across media in the communities they've studied. (Some studies of community political environments and participation which may have been enriched by explicit consideration of newspaper and media factors include Greenstone, 1966; Verba and Nie, 1972, Ch. 13; Crenson, 1974; Cole, 1975; Fischer, 1975, and Hansen, 1975.) Clarke and Evans (forthcoming, page 9) observe, "Political science is appropriately concerned with only certain aspects of electoral process . . . . (But) examination of political systems without incorporating communication vehicles is likely to yield less than satisfying results."

On the other hand, there is a rich lode of research in community political behavior that might add sophistication and nuance to communication research which does not consider variation in communities' structural differences and attitudes, in the influence of political parties and interest groups on communities and their institutions, including newspapers and other media. (Some well-known political studies which appear to be rarely, if ever, cited by communication researchers and might offer communication researchers insight in exploring the roles of media in communities include Bachrach and Baratz, 1962; Black, 1974; Crenson, 1971; Debnam, 1975; Form and Hytina, 1969; Schuman and Gruenberg, 1970; Stone, 1980, and Wilson and Banfield, 1964, 1971.) As Clarke and Evans (forthcoming, page 9) note, communication scholars are as guilty of ignoring political variables as political scientists are of ignoring communication factors. "Separatism clearly robs both disciplines of explanatory power," they conclude.

Operating on the premise that where there is so much heat and smoke, there must be fire, it appears there is an important, if unspecified and largely unexplored, interdependency of community and newspaper, and its contribution to the political health of society would appear to be significant. The implications then for pluralist poli-

tics in the increasing gap between the numbers of urban communities with and without daily newspapers of their own, from 90 per cent in the World War I era to 30 per cent today, are certainly disquieting. Bagdikian (1977) believes ". . . this reversal of the traditional American tendency for each community to serve its self-governing functions with its own news medium . . . . may have radical consequences." He speculates about their form:

> "It could be a contributing factor to the growing inability of municipalities to control their social and political affairs, to the psychological loss of community identity characteristic of newer towns and cities, and to the sluggishness with which urban governments responded to post-war social pathologies and the slowness with which this pathology, once felt, came to national attention . . . "

Bagdikian's speculation gains some indirect support from Verba and Nie's (1972, Ch. 13) study of patterns of participation. They found evidence of higher levels and broader participation in communities characterized by a stronger sense of identity -- they termed it "boundedness" -- and a lesser reliance on media from outside the community than in communities with an uncer-

tain identity and extensive reliance on media originating outside the community. (Verba and Nie called these associations between community "boundedness" and levels of participation the "decline of community model.") Although neither considering communities without newspapers -- as Bagdikian's analysis would suggest, nor considering variance in participation -- as Verba and Nie's model does, Tichenor, Donohue and Olien (1980) found evidence in 19 Minnesota communities that linked the structural characteristics of communities and the character of the roles played by their newspapers in community conflicts. Their findings give rare form to unstated assumptions or theoretical assertions about the interdependencies of newspapers and their communities. At the same time (although not unequivocally), the Minnesota study suggests the credibility of Bagdikian's speculations and Verba and Nie's model, and generally reinforces the importance assigned to the community link in the newspaper's contribution to the present and future health of pluralist democracy.

III.

Changes in Daily Newspapers

In the decade from the late 1960s to the late 1970s, most daily newspapers responded to a general pressure to reconsider their relations with their readers and communities. The impact of these pressures was so great that by

the end of the 1970s, an industry survey (Newspaper Advertising Bureau, 1979; pages 2 and 11) found that " . . . American newspapers (were) experiencing a period of unprecedented, sweeping change" which has affected the very "character of the daily newspaper."[3] The changed character reflects important shifts in the conventions that have defined "local" news and coverage, resulting in new emphases on issues, topics and institutions previously accorded low priorities for attention (Newspaper Advertising Bureau, 1979). While "news" is still the principal ingredient of the daily paper, its staff members now attend to issues of cooking as well as to issues of the courts. Bogart (1981, page 173) notes that ". . . in its expanding feature content, the daily press increasingly partakes of the character of the magazine -- nonthreatening and easy to take. Embedded in a tissue of gourmet recipes, instructions on furniture repair, and counsel on premarital sex, the breaking (and unsettling) news is swathed in reassurances."

In their study of newspapers and conflicts in 19 Minnesota communities, Tichenor, Donohue and Olien (1980) made a useful distinction between newspaper content which was essentially "distributive information" and that which was "feedback information." In general, "'Distributive' information is that which is received and acted upon (by readers) without necessarily requiring any further communi-

cation back to the newspaper or to any other major institutions (page 86)." On the other hand, ". . . feedback information has the potential for stimulating individual or organized reaction or protest (page 86)," and is expressive ". . . of the fourth-estate or watch-dog role role of the press" which arises from its serving ". . .a feedback or 'regulatory' function for other components of the social system, or for the total system itself (page 85)." Then, in terms similar to Schattschneider's, the Minnesota researchers explain further (page 85):

> ". . . Newspaper reporting of debates in the city council, challenges to the school board, labor-management strife, and consumer protests about supermarket prices are all examples of feedback-control. Through reporting the divisions in the society, the newspaper draws attention to problems. By focusing attention, that is, setting agendas for public discussion on social issues, the media are serving a feedback or regulatory function in the system sense of the term."

Generalizing about the implications of a newspaper's tendency toward emphasizing distributive rather than feedback information, Tichenor and his colleagues (pages 103-4) see increasing commonality of interests between editors and authorities in the community and a corresponding growth of opinion among the community's residents that ". . .decisions in the community are both (a) made by a small num-

ber of persons and (b) widely agreed upon within the community once they are made . . . ." To borrow Schatshneider's argument (see page 8, above), distributive content in media does not promote the "socialization of conflict" but rather inhibits involvement of "the wider public" in resolving a community's conflicts; in the long run, distributive information feeds and exacerbates conflicts, feedback information fosters participation and resolution.

Bogart's analysis (1981) of the last decade's changing daily newspaper leaves little doubt that the content of the daily paper is increasingly distributive in character, and that the trend is strengthening. He reflects on the significance of this trend (page 248):

> "The result of all this is that the media no longer tend to be planned, programmed, edited, and produced for the sake of the communications experience that originally motivated their content. In their origins, the mass media represent the impetus to say something -- to get an idea out, to get a message across, to have people listen, react, respond. Today the media are governed by different principles."

These principles are, of course, rooted in the economic conditions which have prompted the redevelop-

ment of the community newspaper as an instrument for ". . . helping the new value consumer seek the full, rich life." These are the words of the chief executive officer of a newspaper chain, who describes the "new value consumer" as a person who has adopted, from the social upheaval of the 1960s, "new ideas about work, sex, religion, money . . . life in general." As a consequence, " . . . newspapers can no longer get by with just printing news. They must also provide information for coping, helping the new value consumer seek self-fulfillment. They must provide information for escaping . . . . " (Marbut, 1979.)

The argument is that the community orientation of the daily newspaper is no longer sufficient to provide the necessary economic support -- in Marbut's words, in the 1980s " . . . the concept of a homogeneous mass audience will no longer be viable." The argument is that, while the relations of newspaper and community are interdependent, so too are the social and political functions of the newspaper interdependent with its economic function. Marbut is representative of many who are responsible for newspapers' financial well-being and whose decisions determine the ultimate character of the newspaper role. Speaking to the American Society of Newspaper Editors four years after they adopted their "Declaration of Principles" (see page 4, above), Marbut (1980) said:

"We had a luxury in the past that we can no longer afford: the luxury of focusing on the special role we play without having to pay much attention to the factors that make it possible for us to perform that role. . . .

"I . . . assume that journalists feel the newspaper must be economically stable in order to fulfill its First Amendment function effectively. That is, there must be financial independence if there is to be editorial independence . . . .

"This means that we must play the economic game, a game with certain principles that cannot be violated.

"The most fundamental of these principles is this: a customer must be satisfied . . . .

"Since the reader is the customer, and the newspaper's content is the product, the editor is inextricably involved with the most fundamental economic challenge facing every newspaper -- customer satisfaction. The editor is also involved in insuring that the newspaper operates at a profit. . . ."

IV.

Conclusion

Newspapers are always in change. Their practices and perspectives are guided by conventions; standards

are accordingly flexible. What is principled about their performance would appear to be dependent on the principles, motives and determination of their journalists, which seem to be exceptional (Johnstone, Slawski and Bowman, 1976). But newspapers also have organizational requirements, and Marbut eloquently summarizes what these have come to be in the 1980s. Bogart's analysis of the Newspaper Advertising Bureau's extensive surveys of changes and innovations in the contents of daily newspapers summarizes the considerable effects of meeting these requirements. What is most striking about Bogart's study of these changes is that they have affected the great majority of newspapers in a period of 15 years or less, and that these changes reflect more than a revision of conventions.

There are myriad implications in these changes, but the most problematic ones are those raised by the pervasive and compelling arguments, both romantic and intellectual, about the role of newspapers and other media in preserving pluralist society through the community nexus. There is an extensive literature in political theory and research, and in sociology and communication, that deserves reanalysis to consider a more explicit relationship between newspapers and community political behavior, and to estimate how these relations might be affected by changes in newspapers and in their orientation to their communities.

References

APSR = American Political Science Review

Bachrach, P. and M. Baratz (1962), "Two Faces of Power," APSR, 56: 947 - 52.

Bagdikian, B. (1971), The Information Machines, New York: Harper & Row.

_____ (1977), "Contemporary Newspapers: More Dollars, Few Readers," lecture, Fort Worth: Texas Christian University.

Black, G. (1974), "Conflict in the Community: A Theory of Effects of Community Size," APSR, 68: 1245-61.

Bogart, L. (1981), Press and Public, Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Clarke, P. and S. Evans (forthcoming), The Broken Quill, Palo Alto: Stanford University.

Cole, R. (1975), "Citizen Participation in Municipal Politics," American Journal of Political Science, 19: 761-81.

Crenson, M. (1971), The Un-Politics of Air Pollution, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.

_____ (1974), "Organizational Factors in Citizen Participation," Journal of Politics, 36: 356-78.

Dahl, R. (1961), Who Governs?, New Haven: Yale University.

Debnam, G. (1975), "Nondecisions and Power: The Two Faces of Bachrach and Baratz," APSR, 69: 889-99; and "Comment" by Bachrach and Baratz, and "Rejoinder" by Debnam, same issue, 900-07.

Emery, E. and M. Emery (1978), The Press and America (4th), Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Fischer, C. (1975), "The City and Political Psychology," APSR, 69: 559-71.

Form, W. and J. Rytina (1969), "Ideological Beliefs on the Distribution of Power in the U.S.," American Sociological Review, 34: 19-31.

Gamson, W. (1968), Power and Discontent, Homewood: Dorsey.

Goldenberg, E. (1975), Making the Papers, Lexington: D.C. Heath.

Greenstone, D. (1966), "Party Pressure on Organized Labor in Three Cities," in Jennings and Zeigler (eds.), The Electoral Process.

Hansen, S. (1975), "Participation, Political Structure, and Concurrence," APSR, 69: 1189-99.

Hecht, B. and C. MacArthur (1928), The Front Page, in B. Cerf and V.H. Cartmell (eds.), Sixteen Famous American Plays (1941), New York: Modern Library.

Hohenberg, J. (1973), Free Press, Free People, New York: Free Press.

Johnstone, J., E. Slawski and W. Bowman (1976), The News People, Urbana: University of Illinois.

Janowitz, M. (1978), The Last Half-Century, Chicago: University of Chicago.

Lipsky, M. (1968), "Protest as a Political Resource," APSR, 62: 1144-58.

Lippman, W. (1922), Public Opinion, New York: Macmillan.

Marbut, R. (1979), "Presentation at the Markets of the 80s Conference, New York City," San Antonio: Harte-Hanks Communications.

_____ (1980), "Remarks at the 1980 Convention of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Washington, D.C.," San Antonio: Harte-Hanks Communications.

Newspaper Advertising Bureau, Inc. (1979), "1979 Inventory of Editorial Content, Summary Tables and Findings (Weekday Editions)," New York.

Nie, N., S. Verba and J. Petrocik (1976), The Changing American Voter (Enlarged), Cambridge: Harvard University.

Polsby, N. (1980), Community Power and Political Theory (2nd enlarged), New Haven: Yale University.

Rivers, W., W. Schramm, C. Christians (1980), Responsibility in Mass Media (3rd), New York: Harper & Row.

Schattschneider, E. (1960), The Semisovereign People, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Schuman, H. and B. Gruenberg (1970), "The Impact of City on Racial Attitudes," American Journal of Sociology, 76: 213-61.

Stone, C. (1980), "Systemic Power in Community Decision Making," APSR, 74: 978-90.

Tichenor, P., G. Donohue, C. Olien (1980), Community Conflict and the Press, Beverly Hills: Sage.

Verba, S. and N. Nie (1972), Participation in America, New York: Harper & Row.

Wilson, J. and E. Banfield (1964), "Public Regardingness as a Value Premise in Voting Behavior," ASPR, 63: 876-87.